

### REMARKS

The following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 24, 2006. In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

#### Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 1 and 4-6 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claims 2-3 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 7-22 stand withdrawn from consideration in this application.

#### Prior Art Rejections

##### U.S.C. §102(e) rejection

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Katayama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,151,807). Claims 2-3 were already canceled in the response to the Office Action filed June 13, 2006, and therefore, it is noted that the rejection of claims 2-3 is both improper and moot. In response to Applicants' inquiry by telephone, the Examiner admitted that the rejection of claims 2-3 was a typographical error. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1 and 5-6 for the reasons set forth below.

According to the M.P.E.P. §2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a), (b), and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

#### Claim 1

A display device as recited in claim 1 is directed to a display device in which, even when a protective film, an insulation film or the like is present above a film containing a defect to be corrected, can eliminate the display defect by correcting only the defect of the lower-layer film containing the defect to be corrected without removing the upper-layer film.

Claim 1 recites that the correction of the correction portion is performed by the irradiation of a laser beam through the at least one upper layer film from a side opposite to the substrate via no other substrate. Because a plurality of films including an insulation film, a semiconductor film and a conductive film are stacked on a substrate as recited in claim 1, the substrate is arranged below the correction portion. In other words, the laser beam is irradiated through at least one upper layer film from an upper side of the correction portion.

The laser beam is not irradiated from the outside of the substrate. As recited in claim 1, at least one upper-layer film is present above a film to be corrected at the correction portion and the correction is applied to the film to be corrected while leaving the upper-layer film as it is. In other words, while a defect portion of the lower-layer film in the display region of the display device comprising a plurality of layer films is corrected by the irradiation of a laser beam through the at least one upper layer film, the upper-layer film of the defect portion is not removed.

In contrast, Katayama shows in Fig. 15 that laser beams 136, 137 are irradiated from lower side of the substance 101. Katayama further states that although the laser beam is radiated from the glass substrate 101 side, it can be radiated from any substrate if both substrates are made of a material through which laser beams can be transmitted (col. 20, lines 32-36). In other words, Katayama shows that laser beams are irradiated via a substrate or substrates. Katayama does not show or suggest either explicitly or implicitly that the laser beam can be radiated via no substrate.

Therefore, Katayama does not show every element recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Katayama.

#### Claims 5-6

As to dependent claims 5-6, the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1 are equally applicable here. The corresponding base claim being allowable, claims 5-6 must also be allowable.

#### 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Katayama in view of Liu et al. (US Patent No. 5,518,956). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P. §2143),

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both not be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure.

As set forth above, Katayama fails to teach all the elements recited in claim 1, from which claim 4 depends.

Liu shows radiating a laser beam via no substrate. However, Liu states that a portion of the energy in the laser beam of ultraviolet light is absorbed in the ITO of common electrode layer 116, and substantially all of the remaining portion of the beam's energy is readily absorbed in the polyimide of dielectric layer 114, and that the absorption of the light by the ITO and the underlying polyimide results in the ablation of the illuminated surfaces (col. 4, lines 38-44). In other words, Liu shows that while the defect 118 is ablated, upper layer film of a defect 118 is also ablated. This feature is completely different from the feature recited in claim 1, namely, that the correction is applied to the film to be corrected while leaving the upper-layer film as is.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion or motivation in either Katayama or Liu to combine these features explicitly or implicitly, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to embody all the features of the invention as recited in claim 1, from which claim 4 depends. Accordingly, claim 4 is not obvious in view of all the prior art recited.

### Conclusion


In view of all the above, Applicants respectfully submit that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance

of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stanley P. Fisher  
Registration Number 24,344

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
Registration Number 34,072

**REED SMITH LLP**  
3110 Fairview Park Drive  
Suite 1400  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042  
(703) 641-4200

**February 26, 2007**  
SPF/JCM/YOM